



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CW
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/316,851	05/21/1999	HAI BUI	003543.P002	8389

7590 07/25/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLER & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

DESANTO, MATTHEW F

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3763

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2003

21

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N.K

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/316,851	BUI, HAI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew F DeSanto	3763

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-8, 16-22, 35, 37, 40-46, 48, 49.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant first argues that the chamber does not store a pressurized fluid. The examiner disagrees with this argument for two reasons, the first being that the Applicant is arguing intended use of the chamber. The examiner notes that this chamber would be capable of performing this function and thus ready on the claim. Further the examiner would like to note that since the chamber is in an accumulator there will be a pressure exerted on the fluid since the fluid is in a closed environment.

The next argument made by the applicant is that the volume sensor is not in fluid communications with the chamber, and that the sensor is not adapted to detect the change of fluid pressure in the chamber. This concept is taught on page 5 and 6 of Peterson.

Next the applicant argues that the system taught by Peterson is not addressing the problem of controlling the flow of irrigation flow through the irrigation line. The examiner disagrees with this statement since this is what the entire reference is disclosing and teaching, a fluid flow and pressure control system; see entire reference.

The Applicant finally argues that his invention has two accumulators, wherein there is one accumulator in the first chamber and a second accumulator in the second chamber, this is taught in the reference because Peterson teaches that the accumulator is broken down into two chambers, wherein each chamber is in communication with an accumulator. The examiner would also like to note that it would be obvious to duplicate a second accumulator with respect to the second chamber for the reasoning of allowing more controlled fluid flow within the system.

Matt

7/14/03

Brian Casler
BRIAN L. CASLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700